REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated December 12, 2008, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 10 and 11. Claims 1-4 and 10-20 are in the case. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-2, 4, 10-12 and 14-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Roztocil (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0044868) in view of Schorr (U.S. Patent 6,608,697) and Kemp (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0078160). The Office Action rejected claims 3 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Roztocil, Schorr and Kemp.

The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and submits that the combined cited references does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the elements of the Applicant's newly amended independent claims.

Namely, the combined references do not disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's newly amended dynamically and automatically creating a document profile for the document file based on specific requirements defined at the designer location and particular capabilities of devices at the print service provider location and automatically adjusting characteristics of the document file based on the dynamically created document profile.

In addition, with regard to claim 11, the combined references also do not disclose, teach or suggest the Applicant's newly amended creating a job ticket at the designer location that specifies production devices of the print service provider to be used to process the print job and processing instructions for the print service provider location. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification, and in particular, in paragraphs [0021] - [0023] and of the Applicant's published patent application, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0030556.

In contrast, the combined cited references merely disclose allowing a customer to submit a job during job origination by either physically delivering to the print shop one or more documents in hard copy or electronic form or by transmitting the one or more documents to the print shop via the Internet (see paragraph [0022] of Roztocil), a

system and method for printing over the Internet, which includes a client, a service provider, and a portal (see paragraph [0035] of Kemp) and a preflight system that compares document elements to identify document elements occurring in the print file that may cause a problem during printing (see Abstract of Schorr).

Although Schorr discloses a preflight system that has a printer profile database, the profile database merely contains "a list of problem document elements and a list of universal resource locator addresses" (see paragraph Abstract of Schorr). Thus, Schorr in combination with Roztocil and Kemp do **not** disclose, teach or suggest features of the Applicant's **newly amended** independent claims.

In particular, the combined cited references are missing the Applicant's newly added **dynamically and automatically creating** a <u>document profile</u> for the document file based on <u>specific requirements</u> defined at the designer location <u>particular capabilities</u> of devices at print service provider location and **automatically adjusting** characteristics of the document file based on the dynamically created document profile. In addition, with regard to claim 11, the combined cited references are missing the Applicant's newly added <u>creating a job ticket</u> at the designer location that **specifies production devices** of the print service provider <u>to be used</u> to process the print job and processing instructions for the print service provider location.

Instead, the profiles in Schorr are printer profiles to "recognize particular document elements from the print file being preflighted" (see col. 6, lines 41-43 of Schorr) and **not** the Applicant's claimed document profile that is dynamically and automatically created based on particular capabilities of devices at the print service provider location and then automatically adjusting characteristics of the document file based on the dynamically created document profile.

Consequently, because Schorr in combination Roztocil and Kemp is missing at least one feature of the independent claims, the Applicant submits that a prima facie case of obviousness does not exist. As a result, the independent claims are patentable and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Further, with regard to the dependent claims, since they depend from the above-argued respective independent claims, they are therefore patentable on the same basis. (MPEP § 2143.03). As such, withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

Thus, it is respectfully requested that all of the claims be allowed based on the

amendments and arguments. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. Additionally, in an effort to further the prosecution of the subject application, the Applicants kindly **requests** the Examiner to telephone the Applicant's attorney at **(818) 885-1575**. Please note that all mail correspondence should continue to be directed to:

Hewlett Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,
Dated: March 11, 2009
By
/Edmond A. DeFrank/
Edmond A. DeFrank
Reg. No. 37,814
Attorney for Applicant
(818) 885-1575 TEL
(818) 885-5750 FAX